



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 674 S Whitney Way
Application Type: Exterior Renovations of a Planned Commercial Site in Urban District (UDD) No. 3
Final Approval is Requested
Legistar File ID # [69784](#)
Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Brad Koning, Sketchworks Architecture, LLC | Steve Doran, Galway Companies, Inc.

Project Description: The applicant is seeking Final Approval for the proposed exterior renovation of the Vintage Brewing Co. The scope of work includes exterior wall painting, repair and painting of the faux wood columns along all sides of the building, new windows along the east façade, and replacement of the shake roof material with copper-colored standing seam.

Project Timeline:

- The UDC received an Informational Presentation on February 23, 2022
- The UDC granted Initial Approval on May 11, 2022
- This proposal does not require Plan Commission review and approval

Approval Standards: The UDC is an **approving body** on this request. The site is located in Urban Design District 3 ("UDD 3"), which requires that the Urban Design Commission review the proposed project using the design standards and guidelines for that district, which can be found in [MGO Section 33.24\(14\)](#).

Summary of Design Considerations

Planning Division staff requests that the UDC make their findings and base their decision on the aforementioned standards and guidelines of UDD 3, as well as the conditions that were part of the Commission's Initial Approval motion as noted below:

- Reducing the overall materials proposed,
- Increasing the cohesiveness of the base and top of the building by utilizing design elements from either the proposed modern architectural style of the existing more retro architectural style. With regard to the proposed metal roof material, staff notes the building material standards per the CC zone district, footnote E states that: *"Metal panels shall be used in conjunction with a palette of materials; shall be a heavy gauge, non-reflective metal."* As proposed, while the metal roof material **appears to meet** this requirement, the applicant will need to continue to work with staff to confirm the non-reflective properties of the material, and
- Providing a rendering of the Whitney way frontage wall that accurately reflects the retaining wall.

Summary of UDC Initial Approval Comments

As a reference, the Commission's comments from the May 11, 2022, Initial Approval are provided below:

- Very nice renderings. Can you remind us the origination for this project? Is there a functional need, or branding issue?

- For the most part it's a branding exercise for the Vintage. The existing building is getting tired, they wanted to give it a more contemporary look. Instead of repairing what is there they want to take it another step further.
- Even the name of the company is Vintage, but I'm not convinced with this approach. Same style and form, similar materiality as what's there, I don't see it as necessarily an improvement, particularly the roof work and the massing. I think the building as is aligns with the brand, the name, and is not necessarily in need of that modernization. I like the planting proposed, the planters on the sides is a very nice touch. I wonder if there's money better spent in other areas of this site: improving the patio space and the landscaping rather than changing the building form and roof.
- I don't love it, but I don't hate it. There's some competing elements that are not working together. The modern approach is the way to go, but some of these elements individually don't work with the building as a whole. The wood looks heavy and foreign on the patio side, like boarded-up windows, and doesn't support the base of the window. The tile or the metal panel on the roof is way too big. I don't know if the yellow is trying to tie into future signage. Each piece works, but not well together.
- The existing building is set apart from the rest of the mall, maybe seeing it as a separate entity would be a valuable thing rather than trying to make it look like it fits in. You're trying to mask what the building wants to be, which is breaking down the geometries. It has more of a pedestrian scale this close to the road, but it's really missing some window areas or some translucency to make the entrance more welcoming. There's a disconnect between what you're keeping and what you're trying to add to it.
- That retaining wall is really tall, unless you're regrading, that is not a true representation of how a pedestrian will see and interact with that façade of the building. I'd like to see that in a more realistic framework.
- This feels like a rebrand or general wanting to change things up. What's the intent and purpose, to give a fresh look, attract new clientele? I want to understand what's driving this.
 - The intent is a new look and feel that maybe spurs more business. The building is a little bit tired, both inside and out, it's a fresh approach to this existing building without spending significant amounts of money.
- I understand the intent that the Commissioners bring. I know this site very well, I love the place and like what I saw in the renderings. To a random person on the street, they won't see anything off. This is a benefit for the business owners, we should give them discretion on how they want to run their show. We're nitpicking this a little bit. I'd be in favor of letting them take the project as is, so to speak.
- People don't go here because of the building. When you have the opportunity to enhance it you can either upgrade the historical architectural elements or modernize. You're trying to rebrand and modernize, give it a new life. You have to go hard or go home, and those windows are a major part. Glazing and bringing in daylight is a major aspect of modern design. Especially if you look at the Whitney Way elevation, it looks like a bay window and the proportions are off. There's a lot you can do, but you have to let go of either the bases around the windows, or some of those other existing elements and just fully modernize it or renovate the building in the same era and style. There's too much conflict between the two.
- I always like to encourage redevelopment. The cedar shake, bay window, the roof all work together very well, but the introduction of modern elements doesn't work for me, it's kind of jarring. The lack of contemporary glazing, the squared off roof is too heavy, and the wood panels.
- We commented on keeping some of the funkiness of this building, this evokes no emotion at all, where at least the existing building has its integrity. It's not an overall improvement, I see seven materials where originally I may have counted four. We've got more going on now, and I agree celebrating the forms of the original building might refresh it in a way you'd be surprised and save some money.
- The planters along the parking lot side are a nice touch. I share the sentiments of this being a funky building, but also respect the owners wishing to make improvements. The overall effect of it is not quite

right, it doesn't flow. The new tech wood is a key part of the design; what is it? I wish I could see the real material. Adding same sized panels on either side of the chimney might help a little bit.

- We do see some of these older buildings being accentuated for their quirky shapes rather than masked over. Embrace it, change the materials, add some color, you could make this more iconic than just covering over it. I understand the budget restraint, maybe just change the perspective of working with an older building.